Having Our Work Cut Out! Reflections on the Australian Association for Research in Education and the Current State of Australian Educational Research

Judith Gill
University of South Australia

Abstract

This paper provides an overview of themes from the history of the AARE and relates them to current debates around educational research, its methodologies, methods and means of dissemination.

Introduction

In this short paper[1] I propose to chart some themes from the history of the Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE) and to argue that at this time more than ever we (that dangerous word: Sennet 1998, Lingard 2001) need a strong association, one that welcomes diversity in all its dimensions and is prepared to do the hard work of promoting and sponsoring educational research in these new, risky and uncertain times.

In Edinburgh last September the 2003 BERA (British Educational Research Association) President, John Furlong, presented a carefully developed exposition of the status and place of educational research within the agenda of Britain's New Labour (which is itself a story of change and contestation). The address was organised around the question 'BERA at thirty: have we come of age?' Furlong laid out some criteria against which, in his view, BERA has not achieved the desired maturity and he proposed some developments that might foster a more comprehensive research association. Much of his presentation was clearly argued and compelling and at the same time it gave rise to some dissident concerns. Apart from the fact that at 33 AARE is some three years older than BERA, I also found myself wondering whether the goal of being 'of age' is the right one for us. From an AARE standpoint the very notion

seemed to suggest a fairly linear developmental trajectory in which a rambunctious ill-disciplined youthfulness would give way to a mature, reflective stance that could be marshalled into a cohesive whole, a picture somewhat at odds with AARE history and practice. Over the last three decades educational research in this country has grown more varied in terms of discipline base, more multifaceted in terms of its foci and increasingly less amenable to particular lines or political platforms. As we enter 2004 AARE is a more disparate body, encompassing a broader range of interests and approaches than ever before. Reflecting on the BERA position I found myself drawn into a caricature of what 'being of age' might mean as it raised for me the following question: Do we want quite so easily to give up strength and vitality born of contestation, to renege on our passionate position taking, to be seen to be holding tight to the zimmer frame of government policy as we conduct our pre-ordered enquiries that find pre-ordained answers?

Of course I would suggest that we do not – after all such has never been the way of the AARE, as I will demonstrate shortly. Indeed this move would run counter to the general direction in which the association has consciously and deliberately proceeded in recent times. In addition I will argue that we need our vibrancy, our riskiness and our passions and certainly all our energies in the enterprise of fostering educational research and safeguarding the positions and practices of researchers. We all know this to be no simple task and yet it is one entirely consistent with the history of this association.

Changes in the association's composition

In 1970, when AARE burst fully fledged upon the world, it was to operate around three key functions in being:

- a forum for discussion through workshops and conferences,
- a pressure group acting for the furtherance of educational research in Australia and
- a clearinghouse for general information among researchers.

AARE's origins were characterised by a good deal of optimism, along with intense wrangling and a readiness to embrace change as inevitable. And indeed there have been changes from the original fairly narrow constellation of members in terms of age, discipline background, qualifications and interests.

In the early 1980s as a young researcher I vividly recall attending my first AARE conference in Adelaide. My overwhelming impression was one of greyness: grey hair,

grey suits and grey beards. While our age profile may not have changed as much as we would like (although the early career researcher work is addressing this), our gender profile certainly has. Without very much fuss and with the help of a few clear-sighted women, the AARE has grown out of the original composition of 91 per cent male to the current female majority. At the same time there continue to be gender issues in our profile, our executive composition, our choice of speakers, our awardees and so on. I write as one of only seven women presidents in the 33 years of our existence, and four of the seven have held office within the last eight years.

Although still somewhat eastern-states-centric, we have achieved a more even geographical spread of membership across Australia than once was the case, and each year we welcome some 10 per cent of our membership from overseas. In terms of member locations, the majority are working at universities in education faculties, and we include members from schools and professional research organisations too. While our early research focus was dominated by psychological studies of children's learning and schooling treatments, the ambit of AARE educational research has broadened to include studies of post-school and workplace learning, teacher professional development, cultural studies, policy analysis and many other areas. For example, the significant changes in university structure and function that have been a feature of Australian education in recent decades have seen increasing numbers of AARE members drawn into research and debates around the role of the university (e.g. Blackmore 2003).

There is however no cause for complacency in this accounting of our membership as there are still significant gaps. We need to work harder to increase diversity in our membership in terms of race and ethnicity – our association is much more racially and ethnically homogenous than the profile of students across Australia, not to mention those offshore for whom Australian education takes responsibility – and this has become an increasing focus of some of our research.

Changes in what is regarded as educational research

In the early days of AARE educational research was dominated by psychological studies accompanied often as not by statistical analysis and projections, a situation that was mirrored in research degree student enrolments. Up until the 1980s the most commonly attempted higher degree in education was a masters and over 75 per cent of masters gained were in the area of educational psychology. Subsequent years have seen the rise and rise of qualitative or interpretative approaches to educational research. Indeed, some commentators suggest that qualitative approaches have become the new orthodoxy in educational research and commend renewed attention to the rigour of such approaches in the interests of high quality research.

A quick glance at the AARE program in recent years will immediately show that the early predominance of psychological studies has been overturned and that researchers are addressing a vastly increased range of topics and doing so from a wide range of foundational disciplines, and frequently from frameworks combining different theoretical positions. While much of the work is grounded in practice, theoretical studies continue to feature within its broad ambit. Australian educational research has indeed become a multifaceted endeavour.

Does this mean we have grown up, after all?

Not so fast. The picture of AARE development is not one of smooth progression wherein the association gained increasing profile and respect in the broader education community. The struggles over what educational research consists of and where it is to happen have been recurrent features in the AARE story – and they are with us still.

First of all there was the problem of education's Cinderella status within the university, a difficulty heightened to some degree by the post-Dawkins university expansion, which Janice Reid (Vice Chancellor at the University of Western Sydney) recently described as causing some academics who had come from the former Colleges of Advanced Education to feel like 'impostors in the university sector' (Reid 2003). In this environment through the eighties and nineties the work of research was seen to operate as a yardstick that discriminated between those who could claim really to belong within the university sector and those whose time was taken up with teaching the increasingly large classes in teacher education. And then there was education's particular town–gown split wherein university-based academics have at times been in competition with research units inside state education departments who control access to schools, teachers and students.

By the late 1980s the research offices within education departments around the country had virtually disappeared. Federal bodies designed to promote educational research were often short-lived affairs whose funding rested with particular strongly prescribed government interests as with the current Department of Education, Science and Training. Currently there are a few consultancy groups, often comprising former academics, who have chosen to invest their whole time and energy in research and, of course, our friend and sponsor the Australian Council for Educational Research with whom we have been in relationship since the beginning.

From these various locations education researchers continue to compete for government funding – because that is just about all there is. The incidence of privately sponsored educational research in Australia is pitifully small. No other industry is as

totally dependent upon government funding for research as education – a point made most clearly last year in the AARE response to the federal government's proposals in *Higher Education at the Crossroads*, the discussion document issued by federal Education Minister Dr Brendan Nelson (2002).

Why is Australian educational research so poorly funded? Sydney philosopher James Franklin recently suggested that we in Australia are 'a government show' (Franklin 2003); we have always been one right from the beginning. We carry a conviction that we function within a larger overarching, if not necessarily benevolent, system. The term offers some explanation of those archetypal aspects of the mythologised Australian character: a readiness to pull together in the interest of some larger good but to not 'rock the boat', not to stand out in any particular way, the tall poppy syndrome and the 'she'll be right, mate – no worries'. Perhaps this disinclination to see problems suggests an explanation for the dearth in Australia of the sort of philanthropy that has been central to the development of educational research within the US. Certainly Franklin's realist pragmatic position is at odds with both the liberal humanist ideal that once inspired educational research and the more recent postmodern turn which advocates suspicion of all master theory and insists on localised multiple truths.

Is this idea of being a 'government show' true for educational research? True many of us came into educational research from a background in teaching and as teachers we were used to balancing the needs of the individual against some notion of the common good, whether that be the class, the school or the wider social group. Teachers necessarily participate in some form of governmentality whether or not they work in government schools. But we come to research out of a desire to question, to seek out patterns, to raise issues and to debate meanings. The annals of this association are testimony to the fact that Australian educational researchers have never been particularly docile, even when their ambit was much narrower than currently. The aims and function of the association have long constituted a site for struggle. For some of the founders of the AARE the association seemed to function as a virtually closed community rather than one that sought to disseminate research knowledge, as seen in the heavy irony in the following:

> Am I right in my belief that the prime audience for our writings as AARE members about our research is our own colleagues … Am I right in also believing that only secondarily do we look for any other audience likely to have a need to do something about the substance of our writing … What do we do research for? (Radford 1975, cited in Bessant and Holbrook 1995, p. 51)

While Radford urged a broader ambit for the knowledge produced by educational research, others sought to engage specifically with politics in their promotion of the cause of educational research:

> If the AARE wished to become a serious pressure group … it would have to make approaches to Ministers of Education, Premiers, departmental officials and the Opposition. The society would have to seek to appear on radio and television. It would have to interest the various teachers unions, parent groups… (Falk 1974, cited in Bessant and Holbrook 1995, p. 49)

And some of these initiatives have been taken up by subsequent executives. But these ideas were not universally accepted. Some years later still others cautioned against too much political engagement, advocating a more cautious position:

> I believe there is no future in the AARE, as an organisation, attempting to follow trends set by government or do more than it currently does in commenting on and responding to changes in Australian education. (Bourke 1994, pp. 16–17)

Since this time we have heard from passionate exponents of the goal of educational research as the straightforward improvement of learning and from others who describe the work much more broadly in terms of its emancipatory potential. Rather than being a unified bunch, AARE history reveals that the association has embraced a range of positions and commended an outspoken practice of debate among them. The commitment to the promotion of educational research is maintained despite considerable differences in its definition and the implications for its practice: what it is, how to go about it and what best to do with the results.

For some time one of the most hotly contested issues concerned the 'split' between qualitative and quantitative investigative approaches, an unproductive binary that has thankfully been overtaken by the growth of a considerable array of newer research methodologies that have transcended the earlier distinction. In his presidential address of 2000, Bob Lingard captured the need for a recognition of the multiplicity of research endeavours:

> While not opposing research whose explicit purpose is improvement of student outcomes and while not opposed to quantitative methodologies, nor opposed to governments establishing research agendas, I will argue that we need a whole lot more. (Lingard 2001, p. 5)

Lingard's vision of educational research goes beyond methodological debates. He sees the question as embracing the reasons for doing research, which themselves commend particular approaches as well as ways of disseminating the results. This position promotes the idea of multiple purposes, agendas and methodologies for educational research. Such hybridisation of the research endeavour presupposes researchers communicating across difference, making some problems and resolving others. And of course the intellectual work that this position demands is far more complex than just talking among ourselves within our particular comfort zone, even if we do that too at the annual conference.

Having briefly touched on the changes in the content and style of educational research, and the debates surrounding these changes, my point is that there is no single approach, method or theoretical frame for educational research in AARE – rather it is a multifaceted field, often originating in particular local contexts but generating much broader applications.

What I want to suggest now is that the most profound change relating to our research in recent times has to do with the political context of education and its implications for research culture. Education, for so long a shifting terrain that collected its meanings around schooling, has been redefined in current discourse.

So what is education now?

First of all there has been a significant expansion in what counts as education. By 2003 Australian education is hailed

- by government as big business;
- by some middle-class parents as a commodity through which one can demonstrate one's good parenting;
- by some government ministers as a private good (as opposed to a public one);
- by unemployed youth as the discriminatory system that one is required to endure to learn that one is unlikely to achieve much in life;
- by private providers as a business that they have to develop to demonstrate that they have the edge in a competitive marketplace, and so on …

While the meanings of education vary according to who is speaking, education has a higher profile as a national issue than before – despite the fact that the reasons for this accession to prominence may not be universally shared. You might think educational research should also have an increased share of the limelight – and the funding. For

instance, the frequent claims made about the quality of Australian education (nowhere more so than in our international marketing campaigns) require grounding in research, but instead we have stories of throughputs and separations and timely completions. The quality of the experience is overlooked in the many glossy brochures offering assurances of material success for future graduates. The knowledge economy has produced educators as assembly line workers and knowledge credentials as a manufactured good. The productivity orientation that has been picked up by educational institutions has resulted in another layer of management whose communications are dominated by a self-serving rhetoric of quality and efficiency. As Jill Blackmore writes, 'The academic becomes a pieceworker serving an expanding new professional middle class of administrators' (Blackmore 2003, p. 5). Economic rationalism and research education are in full-frontal collision – the 'big bang' of which the RTS (Research Training Scheme) is one outcome.

Current federal education policy in Australia contrasts markedly in style with what is happening elsewhere. For instance, whereas the Blair government puts a heavy emphasis on education for transforming social division, for improving productivity as well as individual wellbeing and has proposed a goal of university places for 50 per cent of school leavers, in Australia the current federal minister has repeated his opinion that only 30 per cent will go on to university, and what we need is more skills training. In other words in the UK there is talk of a forward movement, a broadening of the educational experience, which anticipates some degree of social transformation, whereas in Australia the story is one of constraint and rationalisation, a return to status quo. Whereas the US signalled an interest in equity with 'No child left behind', Australia has mandated basic skills tests. The optimism that accompanied the Dawkins reform of the tertiary system – ill-considered as some of that package proved to be – is forgotten. In a particularly prescient paper in 1997 Allan Luke wrote:

> many of the statements of what we might term Dawkins-era Australian educational ideology are being transformed into powerful conservative educational projects: a new transformation of economic rationalism and relatedly a move towards the quantification of educational outcomes and performance at all levels. (Luke 1997, p. 17)

And so we have 'policy in a hurry' as education has become another business and its funding is increasingly tied to short-term outcomes and delivered in concert with mechanisms of control that seek to further reduce the autonomy of the school, preschool, TAFE or university.

Nor is educational research doing well in terms of its capacity to attract funding. Of the recent Australian Research Council grants – which have become the main source

of large-scale funding for educational research – education successes were rare indeed. In all, fifteen education projects were funded in the latest Discovery grants out of the 875 funded projects altogether; education received less than 2 per cent of the number of grants; in money terms the percentage is lower still.

The current set of federal government priorities for research appear not to embrace educational issues to any clear degree. In many respects it seems that educational research has drawn the short straw in the research game as currently orchestrated. And yet educational research has never been more important, more relevant to the sort of reform and redevelopment that a knowledge-based society would seek.

What counts as educational research?

Meanwhile what counts as research has also undergone significant change. Having lived through a view of research culture as paradigmatic and afflicted by internal rivalries, we in Australia, along with the US and the UK, are now seeing the return of a press for large-scale studies and random controlled trials – the 'big science' or 'medical model' approach is being broadly commended – and funding follows. 'What works?' is the catch cry and 'evidence-based' is the magic formula (which of course begs the question of what counts as evidence). The pluralist approach to educational research which has been a feature of recent AARE history (and described by Lingard 2001) is at risk in these moves to reinstate the 'one true way' of doing the job.

Moreover, the promotion of random controlled trials and evidence-based practice as both the basis and goal of educational research has been fuelled to some degree by some of the very people who had been prominent in the adoption of more person-friendly qualitative approaches two decades ago. In the UK Ann Oakley stands in this respect but also David Hargreaves who, along with James Tooley, has led the charge against small-scale qualitative studies. In the UK and the US significant government interest and funding has supported the return of the 'big science' model. For example, the Research Capacity Building Network in the UK has called for 'theoretically informed, large-scale, publicly relevant rigorous research' (Furlong 2003). Further evidence of support for this approach is the establishment of the EPPI Centre (Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Coordinating Centre, Institute of Education, University of London), national statements about research directions, requirements for federal funding of schools and so on. Such moves have not happened without significant contestation.

In the US senior educationalists have argued that the time is right for moving beyond 'particularised' views and focusing on 'building a shared core of norms and practices that emphasise scientific principles' (Feuer et al. 2002). Sandra Harding's feminist

challenge about *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?* (Harding 1991) is obviously relevant here. While Feuer and his colleagues attempted to claim a middle ground by taking a broad view of science in terms of a culture of inquiry rather than rigid methodological prescriptions, other US scholars fear that this stance may still focus too narrowly on 'experimentally derived causal explanations of educational program effectiveness' (Erickson and Gutierrez 2002, p. 21). To some degree these debates recall those of the early days of AARE in which the then mainstream psychologically based research approaches were under challenge. Currently however the stakes are not simply those derived from discipline base or research paradigm; they are much higher in that they directly relate to research funding and hence the viability of the research endeavour.

Meanwhile still other American scholars insist that there is currently a censorship of research outcomes that do not concur with accepted public sentiment. They write of 'web scrubbing' through the research databases to remove any trace of research findings that are unacceptable to the current government positions (Fonow 2003, personal communication). This story may once have been dismissed as apocryphal; however in recent weeks in Australia there have been reports of the federal minister wanting to restrict and censor research topics in PhD enrolments so that only those considered appropriate by a government committee will be allowed to go ahead. Control of research agendas should not be left to political interests but must involve people whose intellectual work is that of research. Just one more reason for the AARE to have a strong voice in this matter. Research is indeed a risky business.

While the current situation appears rather grim – and I suspect that colleagues in Aotearoa/New Zealand are better positioned than those in Australia in terms of current government policy and commitments – it is also true that the task of promoting Australian educational research has never been more necessary. And the risk that looms for many of us is that our work will be cut out of funding opportunities unless we conform to the big science model. What is needed then is a strong voice that can demonstrate the usefulness and productivity of a broad-ranging approach to research questions. And that means talking across different approaches as well as within them.

What do we know about Australian education?

In recent years educational research, at macro and micro levels, has revealed major deficiencies within our educational systems. We know that we have serious issues connected with

- schools working with families where there is generational unemployment;
- class sizes maintained by formulae that make little allowance for young people with social and emotional problems;

- the whole question of refugee children and their schooling needs;
- increasing disparity between rich and poor schools;
- the issue of vocational education and its role within schooling and the post-compulsory years;
- the massification of higher education and its attempt to cater for increasing numbers of international students;
- the increasingly fraught debates about the quality and provision of early childhood education.

The broader issues of gender justice and ethnic and racial equity are bound up with the differential distribution of wealth and material goods that educational research has repeatedly shown to be implicated in just about every educational issue. There is an urgent need to turn to research to generate appropriate policies and workable strategies in these troubling times. And we need a mix of research methods to develop a full picture of what's involved. Sometimes it will be insights gained from small-scale 'practitioner research' or even single-instance studies – such as Chris Sarra's presentation on Indigenous education at the 2002 AARE conference (Sarra 2002) – which work to 'sharpen perceptions, stimulate discussion and encourage questioning' (Nisbet and Broadfoot 1980, p. 66). At other times large-scale studies can be useful in 'disclosing relations not otherwise apparent', which was Dewey's view of the purpose of educational research (Dewey 1960, p. 85). At this stage of our evolution as educational researchers I think we have to say we still need and will continue to need both micro and macro studies from a range of standpoints in constructing understanding of how education works and for whom and what might be done about it.

More rigour?

At the same time I agree with Furlong's comments about the need to generate more rigour in our work. His point is that, while there are many excellent examples of research, there are too many seriously flawed studies that are unlikely to have any worthwhile impact. Furlong urged much more thorough critique and monitoring of educational research generally. In the current environment of credential creep, where the reviewing of academic papers, thesis supervision and examination has become an increasingly large part of the intellectual work of education academics, Furlong's comment stands as a summary reminder of our responsibility to the broad field of educational research.

It seems pointless to rehearse here the acrimonious epistemological debates of former times. Rather we need to acknowledge differences between research approaches and

the knowledges that can be gained from them and, perhaps more importantly, we need to be more open to critique within our particular fields, rather than seeing ourselves as embattled foot soldiers within one camp or another. Furlong's idea that 'a rich and diverse community that contributes in a variety of ways to the betterment of education cannot afford to prioritise one approach at the expense of another' (Furlong 2003) appears equally relevant here.

A public presence?

In our advocacy of educational research we also need to make research knowledge more publicly available and accessible in the interests of a better informed citizenry.

> If the notion of 'evidence' is to mean anything other than the intellectual property of elite groups, the accessibility of both the process and the results of research synthesis to a range of users must be an integral value. (Oakley 2002, p. 279)

On a recent visit to the UK I was struck yet again by the vigour and quality of education reporting – in all or nearly all the daily papers articles about education appeared as top billing, a situation that presupposes an acute public interest in questions such as university access, school funding, teaching processes, curriculum issues and so on. And yet back in Australia education or even schooling appears to hold little public interest, judging by the dearth of education reporting in the papers – certainly not the sort of feature that would attract widespread attention, and rarely a front page item. And educational research would appear to have just about fallen off the agenda entirely.

From its inception the AARE understood itself to have a role in the dissemination of educational research to as wide a public as possible. Clearly this is also an area in which we could improve. We must continue to monitor our research in terms of its conceptual clarity and theoretical soundness – but then we also have to work to make it accessible to the wider public in the interests of growing a community that is informed by and aware of educational issues and research findings and possibilities. In quoting Barone's phrase here, I am irresistibly reminded of the story which I heard as a child of the kiwi bird whose capacity for flight declined though lack of use – long before the 'use it or lose it' slogan became popular. 'As intellectuals became academics they had no need to write in a public prose; they did not and finally they could not' (Barone 1992, p. 22). I think there is a clear message here for educational researchers.

Australian educational research – now!

In closing I want to advocate a position that does not reject large-scale studies or big science models outright – we need them possibly more than some of us have been ready to admit. But we also need the close-grained locally embedded work from a range of other theoretically informed research approaches in order to locate the insights from large-scale studies in the particular spaces and places within which education takes place. And we need to people them with thinking, feeling individuals who form part of the multilayered conversations in which education happens – not just as illustrative examples but in carefully theorised accounts that themselves generate insights and replications in the best research traditions. We need to do all this in ways that are consciously rigorous and purposeful and we need to write about it, not just for our academic journals but also for a wider audience that includes government policy makers and the general public. And even if we do all this we still may not be seen as having 'come of age'. As Allan Luke said in last year's Radford lecture (Luke 2002), 'We surely have our work cut out for us'.

Notes

[1] This paper was originally given as a President's Address at the joint conference of the New Zealand and Australian Associations for Research in Education, Auckland, 30 November 2003.

References

Barone, T. (1992) A narrative of enhanced professionalism: educational researchers and popular storybooks about school people, *Educational Researcher*, vol. 21, no. 8, pp. 15–24.

Bessant, B. and A. Holbrook (1995) *Reflections on Educational Research in Australia: A History of the Australian Association for Research in Education*, Professional Resources Services, Coldstream, Victoria.

Blackmore, J. (2003) Tracking the nomadic life of the educational researcher: what future for feminist public intellectuals and for the performative university? *Australian Educational Researcher*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 1–23.

Bourke, S. (1994) Some responses to changes in Australian education, *Australian Educational Researcher*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1–18.

Dewey, J. (1960) *The Quest for Certainty: A Study of the Relation of Knowledge and Action*, Capricorn Books, New York.

Erickson, F. and K. Gutierrez (2002) Culture, rigor and science in educational research, *Educational Researcher*, vol. 31, no. 8, pp. 21–4.

Feuer, M., L. Towne and R. Shavelson (2002) Scientific culture and educational research, *Educational Researcher*, vol. 31, no. 8, pp. 4–14.

Franklin, J. (2003) ABC Radio Interview on the launch of his book *Corrupting the Youth: The History of Philosophy in Australia*, 5 November.

Furlong, J. (2003) BERA at 30: have we come of age? Presidential address to the annual BERA conference, Heriot Watt University, Edinburgh, September.

Harding, S. (1991) *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?: Thinking from Women's Lives*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Lingard, B. (2001) Some lessons for educational researchers: repositioning research in education and education in the research, *Australian Educational Researcher*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 1–46.

Luke, A. (1997) New narratives of human capital: recent redirections in Australian educational policy, *Australian Educational Researcher*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 1-22.

Luke, A. (2002) Millennial matters/generational changes: the untidy relationships between educational research, schooling and state policy. Radford Lecture, AARE conference, Brisbane, December.

Nelson, B. (2002) *Higher Education at the Crossroads: An Overview Paper*, Department of Education, Science and Technology, Canberra.

Nisbet, J. and P. Broadfoot (1980) *The Impact of Research on Policy and Practice in Education*, Aberdeen University Press, Aberdeen.

Oakley, A. (2002) Social science and evidence-based everything: the case of education, *Educational Review*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 277–86.

Reid, J. (2003) ABC Radio National interview, 11 November.

Sarra, C. (2002) Strong and smart: the role of Cherbourg State School in forging a new Aboriginal identity. Keynote address at the AARE conference, Brisbane, December.

Sennet, R. (1998) *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*, Norton, New York.